

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(Attorney Docket No. 15069US02)

In the Application of:

C. Lutkemeyer

Serial No.: 10/650,641

Filed: August 28, 2003

For: SWITCHING ACTIVITY REDUCED
CODING FOR LOW-POWER
DIGITAL SIGNAL PROCESSING
CIRCUITRY

Examiner: C. D. Ngo

Group Art Unit: 2193

Confirmation No.: 7467

Customer No.: 23446

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via EFS-Web to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on December 8, 2006.

/Shawn L. Peterson/

Shawn L. Peterson

Reg. No. 44,286

COMMENTS ON STATEMENTS OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

MS: Issue Fee
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This paper responds to the Examiner's statement of allowable subject matter set forth in the Detailed Action that accompanied allowance of this case. The Detailed Action provides that claims 1-30 are allowable.

To the extent that the Examiner's statement suggests or states that certain limitations not found in the prior art are present in each and every claim (whether or not specific language to that effect is actually found in every claim), the Applicant notes that the record as a whole, namely, the actual claim language, supplements the Examiner's statement. More specifically, for example and without limitation, the Examiner's statement may imply that the limitations of claim 1 are found in each of claims 10-30, when in fact that is not the case.

Appln. No.: 10/650,641
Response dated Dec. 8, 2006
Reply to Notice of Allowance of Sept. 20, 2006

Moreover, the Applicant believes that the Examiner's statement may imply that the dependent claims are also allowable only for the reasons set forth in the Detailed Action. However, the Examiner's reasons do not discuss any of the other elements of the claimed subject matter, in particular those additional elements recited by dependent claims 2-9, 11-14, 16-20, 22-28 and 30, all of which the Applicant believes are also not found in the prior art and render the dependent claims independently allowable.

Further, Applicant believes that the Examiner's statement may imply that independent claims 1, 10, 15, 21 and 29, and all claims depending therefrom, are also only allowable for the reasons set forth in the Detailed Action. However, the Examiner's reasons do not specifically address all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 10, 15, 21 and 29, and do not discuss any of the other elements of the claimed subject matter, in particular those additional elements recited by dependent claims 2-9, 11-14, 16-20, 22-28 and 30, all of which the Applicant believes are also not found in the prior art and render each of claims 1-30 independently allowable.

Accordingly, Applicant interprets the Examiner's statement to be a statement of only one reason for allowance of the claims, and that other reasons also exist for allowance of the claims, such as, for example, those set forth more completely in the record as a whole. This interpretation is consistent with MPEP § 1302.14, which states that any statement of reasons for allowance "[i]s not intended to necessarily state all the reasons for allowance or all the details why claims are allowed and should not be written to specifically or impliedly state all the reasons for allowance are set forth."

If the Examiner disagrees with the Applicant's interpretation, the Applicant respectfully requests that, prior to issuance, the Examiner withdraw the existing statement of reasons for allowance and simply rely on the record as a whole, or clarify the existing statement of reasons for allowance.

Finally, the Examiner has characterized various references in his statement regarding allowable subject matter. The Applicant agrees with the Examiner that claims 1-30 are allowable in view of all of the references made of record, either alone or in combination. However, the Applicant does not agree nor disagree with the Examiner's characterization of

Appln. No.: 10/650,641
Response dated Dec. 8, 2006
Reply to Notice of Allowance of Sept. 20, 2006

those references, including whether such references are prior art for the present application, and reserves the right to argue his own characterization or that such references are not prior art should that need arise in the future.

If the Examiner has any questions, or if the Applicant can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any other fees required by this submission, or credit any overpayment, to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Dated: December 8, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Shawn L. Peterson/
Shawn L. Peterson
Reg. No. 44,286

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 W. Madison St., Ste. 3400
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 775-8000